

REMARKS

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview of January 14, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner said that a review of Ivory and Strand seems to indicate that these references fail to disclose “wherein the source fluid flow channel crosses over the target fluid flow channel *in an X fashion* at the cross-channel area” that is now recited in amended claims 1 and 22. Please note that claims 1 and 22 also recite “a field-force/gradient mechanism proximate the porous membrane, wherein the field-force/gradient mechanism comprises an electric field configured to produce a fluid movement of a fluid from the source fluid flow channel to the target fluid flow channel via the porous membrane located in the cross-channel area.” These limitations are supported by paragraphs [0025]-[0030] and Figures 2 and 3 of the specification.

New claims 55-64 are supported by paragraph [0024] and Figure 2, paragraph [0035], and paragraph [0037] and Figure 4 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 15, 19-22, 29-31, 33, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,277,258 to Ivory et al. (hereinafter "Ivory").

Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 15, 19-22, 29-31, 33, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 2006/0124459 to Strand et al. (hereinafter "Strand").

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended to recite “wherein the source fluid flow channel crosses over the target fluid flow channel *in an X fashion* at the cross-channel area” and “a field-force/gradient mechanism proximate the porous membrane, wherein the field-force/gradient mechanism comprises an electric field configured to produce a fluid movement of a fluid from the source fluid flow channel to the target fluid flow channel via the porous membrane located in the

cross-channel area.” These limitations are nowhere disclosed in Ivory or strand. In particular, as clarified during the interview with the Examiner, neither Figure 2 of Strand nor Figure 22 of Ivory show that “the source fluid flow channel crosses over the target fluid flow channel *in an X fashion* at the cross-channel area” As anticipation rejection requires that each prior art reference should disclose each and every element and limitation of each claim, the anticipation rejections over Ivory and Strand should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 13-18, 32, 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,277,258 to Ivory or US Patent Number 2006/0124459 to Strand, in view of US Patent Number 6,248,539 Ghardiri et al, hereinafter ("Ghardiri").

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended to as explained above to include limitation that are nowhere disclosed in Ivory or strand. Also, Ghardiri fails to fill these gaps in Ivory and Strand. As obviousness rejection requires that the prior art should disclose the claimed invention *as a whole*, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/
Raj S. Davé, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 42,4653
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(202) 639-7515
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Intel Corporation